

**REMARKS**

**I. Status**

The Office Action indicates claims 43-62 to be pending in this Application, with the Office Action indicating claims 1-42 to be withdrawn from consideration. With this response, claims 43, 49, 54, and 57 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 43, 44, 46, 47, 49-52, 54-58, 60, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskin (U.S. Patent No. 5,307,055).

Claims 45, 48, 53, 59, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskin in view of Harrison (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,420).

Claims 43, 49, 54, and 57 are independent.

**II. Rejection of Independent Claims 43, 49, 54, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. 103**

The Office Action rejects independent claims 43, 49, 54, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskin.

However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Baskin fails, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... a splitting application configured to split received data into at least two parts for displaying at least two substantially different images ...”

as set forth in each of claims 43 and 57 (emphasis added).

As another example, Baskin fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... splitting the obtained data into at least two parts for displaying at least two substantially different images ...”

as set forth in claim 49 (emphasis added).

As a further example, Baskin fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... computer readable code, which when executed by a processor causes the processor to split data obtained by a mobile terminal into at least two parts for displaying at least two substantially different images ...”

as set forth in claim 54 (emphasis added).

The Office Action indicates that such is taught among column 5 lines 6-22, column 9 lines 45-52, and Fig. 8a of Baskin.

However, the Applicant respectfully observes that these portions of Baskin fail, for instance, to discuss any splitting of data, and instead merely discuss there being a combined memory wherefrom output can be provided to both of the displays from the same or different parts of the memory:

“... as illustrated in FIG. 8b, the auxiliary display memory 15 and the display control logic device 98 may be integrated with main display logic and memory, thus providing the output of the generator means 10 intended for the main graphics monitor 12. In this implementation, the generator means 10, housing the control adapter device 13, simultaneously provides output both for the main graphics monitor 12 and the auxiliary monitor 18 from the same or different parts of the combined main display memory and auxiliary display memory 97”  
(see Baskin col. 5 ln. 12-22; emphasis added).

As an additional example, Baskin fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... a wireless short-range transmitter coupled to the processor and configured to transmit at least one of the at least two parts wirelessly to an external display device”

as set forth in claim 43 as amended herewith, and as similarly set forth in claim 57 as amended herewith.

As another example, Baskin fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... transmitting at least one of the at least two parts wirelessly to the external display device”

as set forth in claim 49 as amended herewith.

As a further example, Baskin fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... transmit at least one of the at least two parts wirelessly to an external display device”

as set forth in claim 54 as amended herewith.

The Office Action contends that:

“Baskin does teach the interface 50, Fig. 2, can be a wireless interface as shown on col. 6, lines 37-44, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the interface at nodes D-F (Fig. 3) to be a short range transmitter in order to transmit data locally and wirelessly”  
(see Office Action p. 2 - p. 3).

The Applicant notes that Baskin explains “bi-directional interface 50” to merely “coupl[e]” “microprocessor 14 ... to the generator means 10”:

“[t]he microprocessor 14 is coupled to the generator means 10 through a bi-directional interface 50”  
(see Baskin col. 6 ln. 37-38; emphasis added).

For at least the reason that an interface that couples a microprocessor to generator means is not at all like an entity that transmits to an external display device, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action’s contention.

As an additional example, Baskin fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a “mobile terminal” as set forth in each of claims 43, 49, 54, and 57.

The Office Action contends that Baskin teaches a mobile terminal via “display control device 11.”

However, the Applicant respectfully observes that Baskin fails, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest “display control device 11” to be a mobile terminal, and instead merely discusses that:

“[t]he display control device 11 comprises a control adapter device 13, incorporating a microprocessor 14 (display control logic means) and an auxiliary display memory 15 (storage means) and a remote control device 17 (remote control means), incorporating an auxiliary monitor 18 (secondary display means). The remote control device 17 also incorporates an array of pushbutton switches. Other input means such as a trackball can also be used to control the generator means 10 and the images displayed on the main monitor 12, as well as the auxiliary monitor 18” (see Baskin col. 3 ln. 66 - col. 4 ln. 8).

Moreover, the Office Action, taking display control device 11 to be a mobile terminal, apparently contends that Baskin teaches various operations to be performed by a mobile terminal by Baskin discussing those operations as being performed by graphics generator means 10.

However, the Applicant respectfully observes, for example, that even if, for the sake of argument, display control device 11 is taken to be a mobile terminal and graphics generator 10 is taken to perform such operations, Baskin would still fail, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest such operations to be performed by a mobile terminal for at least the reason that Baskin discusses graphics generator 10 to be separate from display control device 11.

In view of at least the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 43, 49, 54, and 57 at least with the amendments herewith, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

### **III. Dependent Claim Rejections**

The Applicant does not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as the Applicant believes that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. The Applicant, however, reserves the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and

appropriate.

**CONCLUSION**

The Applicant respectfully submits that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4353.


Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: October 30, 2007

By:

  
Angus R. Gill  
Registration No. 51,133

**Mailing Address:**  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, New York 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8700  
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)